SOLICITOR

ਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਵਾਲੇ 7 AO 121 (6/90)	SOLIC	CITOR		
TO:	OCT 2	5 2007		
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AS PATENT & TRADEMARKS (USPTO) P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 (In compliance with the Act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 814; 35 U.S.C.		FILING OF DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION OR APPEALREGARDING A COPYRIGHT		
Tiled on the following patent(s) in the U.S. DOCKET: 02-CV-7611	DATE FILED 10/23/02	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION		
PLAINTIFF: IP Innovation L.L.	C., et al,	DEFENDA	NT: Minolta Cor	·p.
PATENT NO.	DATE OF PA	TENT	TENT PATENTEE	
No. 5,424,780-C1	06/13/95. Then again on 07/23/02		IP Innovation La Technology Lice	L.C. and nsing Corporation
<u> </u>				
·				
e grand				
In the above-entitled case, t	he following patent(s)	have been inc	luded:	
DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY	[] Answer	[] Cross Bill	[] Other Pleading
PATENT NO.	DATE OF PATENT		P.	ATENT
In the above-entitled case,	the following decision	has been ren	dered or judgment i	ssued:
DECISION/JUDGMENT : Minute ord granted (and Agreed Order of Dism	er of 02/14/07: Plaintiffs' a issal). Judge Charles P. Koo	greed motion fo coras. (Certified	r entry of stipulated ord copies attached).	ler of dismissal is
CLERK MICHAEL W. DOBBINS	DEPUTY CLERK Angela Revis	ula Bu	DATE: 10/2	23/07

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Charles P. Kocoras	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge		
CASE NUMBER	02 C 7611	DATE	2/14/2007	
CASE TITLE	IP Innovations et al vs. Lexmark International, Inc.			

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Plaintiffs' agreed motion [185] for entry of stipulated order of dismissal is granted. Enter Agreed Order of Dismissal. Said dismissal is without prejudice for the purpose of allowing the Court to retain jurisdiction over the case for purposes of enforcing the settlement between Lexmark and the Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs and Lexmark shall each bear their own costs and attorneys' fees.

■ [For further detail see separate order(s).]

Docketing to mail notices.

2007 FEB 14 PM 35 72 U.S. PISTAICT COURT

Courtroom Deputy SCT
Initials:

A TRUE COPY - ATTEST MICHAEL W. DOBBINS, CLERK

02C7611 IP Innovations et al vs. Lexmark International, Inc.

U.S. DISTRICTORY, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Page I of I

OCT 2 3 2007

DATE: _

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

IP INNOVATION L.L.C. and TECHNOLOGY LICENSING CORPORATION,		Civil Action No. 02 C 7611
Plaintiffs	s,))	Honorable Chartes P. Kocoras Magistrate-Judge Mason
٧.)	
LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.,		
Defenda	ant.)	

AGREED ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiffs and defendant Lexmark International Inc. ("Lexmark") have agreed to a compromise and settlement of all claims and counterclaims that were or could have been made by them in this Civil Action and, based upon that agreement and the consent of plaintiffs and Lexmark as set forth below, it is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over plaintiffs and Lexmark.
- 2. In accordance with the settlement reached as embodied in a written agreement dated February 6, 2007, all claims and counterclaims made in this Civil Action by plaintiffs against Lexmark and by Lexmark against the plaintiffs are hereby dismissed, but without prejudice solely for the purpose of allowing the Court to retain jurisdiction over the case for purposes of enforcing the settlement between Lexmark and the Plaintiffs.

A Total

3. Plaintiffs and Lexmark shall each bear their own costs and attorneys' fees.

SO ORDERED:

Charles P. Kours

United Stated District Judge FEB 1 4 2007

AGREED TO:

/s/ Paul J. Hayes

Paul J. Hayes
Gene Feher
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris
Glovsky and Popeo P.C.
One Financial Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02111
Fax: (617) 542-2241
Attorneys for Lexmark

International, Inc.

/s/Paul C. Glbbons
Raymond P. Niro
Joseph N. Hosteny
Arthur A. Gasey
Paul C. Gibbons
Niro, Scavone, Haller & Niro
181 West Madison, Suite 4600
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Telephone: 312-236-0733
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

A TRUE CONDITION OF THE RIVER O